

RECEIVED

OCT 26 1999

EIS000459

102

1 MS. SNYDER: Hello, my name is Susi Snyder,  
2 and I'd like to start off by saying I'm a member of the  
3 generation that lives on bottled water. We can't drink the  
4 water in the streams, in the lakes, can't eat the fish that  
5 come out of the rivers that go by our homes. The National  
6 Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is our charter for  
7 protection of the environment and all the living things  
8 within it.

9 The NEPA process of which this hearing is  
10 a part is intended to help public commissions make decisions  
11 that are based on understanding of environmental consequences  
12 and take actions that protect, restore and enhance the  
13 environment. [ The DOE's proposed action regarding Yucca  
14 Mountain, putting this entire country in deadly risk of radioactive  
15 contamination, it will not protect, restore or enhance the  
16 environment. The science clearly shows Yucca Mountain is not  
17 a safe or sane place to put nuclear waste. The only thing  
18 pushing this forward is politics. And science, not politics,  
19 has to be the major player in this decision.

20 The responsibility we have to the next 700  
21 generations requires it. This proposed action fails to  
22 address the current demands of the nuclear industry. [ Not

1  
continued  
on page 3

2

2 continued 1 only is Yucca Mountain riddled with earthquake faults and  
2 slowing filling with geothermal waters, but there are  
3 3 thousands more tons of nuclear waste at sites around the  
4 country that are not destined for Yucca Mountain. What does  
5 the DOE plan on doing with the rest of it? What is the next  
6 sacrifice zone going to be and who is going to monitor these  
7 wastes for the next 10,000 years, the next 250,000 years?  
8 Who is going to warn the children of the future that they are  
9 playing in a place of poison fire?  
10 In regards to the no action alternative as  
4 11 stated in the DEIS, it doesn't meet the NEPA requirement that  
12 it is a reasonable alternative to the proposed action. DOE  
13 recognizing that neither of these scenarios is likely to  
14 occur if there was a decision not to develop a repository at  
15 Yucca Mountain, however, the part of the analysis to provide  
4 continued 16 a comparison. Now, tell me, if the alternative is not  
17 reasonable, then how can what it's being compared to be  
18 reasonable?  
19 Once again, you see that this is not the  
5 20 answer to the problem of nuclear waste in this country. A  
21 realistic no action alternative, one I would have like to  
22 have seen, would have been to suggest that these 77 sites

1 stop their production of spent nuclear fuel and high-level  
5 continued 2 radioactive waste, and that indeed all aspects of the nuclear  
3 chain cease until a safe and sane solution to the nuclear  
4 waste nightmare can be come to with a clean conscience. ]

5 [ This Draft EIS will recognize a strong  
6 native American opposition. It dismisses it. That is  
6 7 environmental. It provides no response to Nevada native  
8 Americans that this dump would be placed on sacred land.  
9 Western Shoshone nation has already been the target of the  
10 United States nuclear genocide program with over 1,000 atomic  
11 bombs detonated.

12 The people who live closest to this proposed  
13 dump are once again being targeted. And for this, we are  
14 furious. These issues of environment racism are not an  
15 adequate nor are there suggestions in the protested action on  
16 how to avoid continued environmental racism. No one wants to  
17 live near an area that as been contaminated with radiation.  
18 Unfortunately, there are over 100 such sites in 24 countries.

19 [ Everywhere that radioactive material has  
20 been used and/or produced is its own nuclear waste dump.  
1 continued 21 There's absolutely no reason to risk moving it across the  
22 country to an unsafe repository. ] This is not a solution to

1 the problem. We need to look at the whole picture and not at  
2 these small fragments of it. Only when the production of  
3 nuclear waste is stopped will we realize how huge this  
4 catastrophe is. It's huge. It's 250,000 years long. Then  
5 maybe we will begin to find a safe and sane way to deal with  
6 it.

7 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds please.

8 MS. SNYDER: I'd like to close. [I request  
9 if this -- in the event that this proposed action go forward,  
10 I see a need for another Environmental Impact Statement  
11 regarding all the routes -- it's needed to the safety  
12 concerns of the over 50 million people who live within a mile  
13 of these routes. The routes themselves need to be identified  
14 and hearings to inform and take comments from these  
15 communities as required by NEPA are necessary to enable the  
16 public to protect themselves from what could be a Chernobyl  
17 type disaster happening in their own backyards,] and I thank  
18 you for this time, and I hope it doesn't happen.